

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Hit/No Hit Criteria
Date: 06/09/2008 09:13 AM

Sorry Eric, I couldn't get on VPN on Friday. We agreed to the 10, 20 and 30 well before the mapping. We had several meetings in prep for the benthic interpretive approach in the PRE and other documents. I will pull up what I have and get it to you today.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 9:10 AM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: Hit/No Hit Criteria

Jennifer, it seems like we have been discussing this topic for some time. At this point, we need to come to resolution quickly. I went back to the March 18, 2005 document "Estimating Risks to Benthic Organisms Using Sediment Toxicity Tests." This document was approved by EPA. In this document, the LWG proposed a minor effect level based on a 10% difference for the two mortality endpoints, a 25% difference for the Hyalella growth endpoint and a 20% difference for the Chironomus growth endpoint. For moderate to severe effects, the LWG proposed a 25% difference for the two mortality endpoints, a 40% difference for the Hyalella growth endpoint and a 30% difference for the Chironomus growth endpoint. Only two levels of effect were presented consistent with Washington DOE SQS and CSL standards. They also proposed a pooled endpoint criteria.

What is unclear to me is why we deviated from this approved approach. Do you know the history of this? Do you recall where the 10%, 20% and 30% framework first showed up? The first place I recall seeing it was in the mapping that NOAA performed last year to support our identification of Round 3B data gaps. I also found in my files a powerpoint presentation from July 2005 in which the LWG presented some different hit/no hit criteria.

Any ideas?

Eric